

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF MASSACHUSETTS**

Michael and Janice Tremblay,

Plaintiff,

v.

EOS CCA; and
DOES 1-10, inclusive,

Defendants.

:
:
: Civil Action No.: _____
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:
:

COMPLAINT

For this Complaint, the Plaintiff, Michael Tremblay, by undersigned counsel,
states as follows:

JURISDICTION

1. This action arises out of Defendants' repeated violations of the Fair Debt Collection Practices Act, 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq. ("FDCPA"), and the invasions of Plaintiff's personal privacy by the Defendants and its agents in their illegal efforts to collect a consumer debt.

2. Supplemental jurisdiction exists pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1367.

3. Venue is proper in this District pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391(b), in that the Defendants transact business in this District and a substantial portion of the acts giving rise to this action occurred in this District.

PARTIES

4. The Plaintiff, Michael Tremblay ("Plaintiff"), is an adult individual residing in Woburn, Massachusetts, and is a "consumer" as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

5. The Plaintiff, Janice Tremblay (“Plaintiff”), is an adult individual residing in Woburn, Massachusetts, and is a “consumer” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(3).

6. Defendant EOS CCA (“EOS”), is a Massachusetts business entity with an address of 700 Longwater Drive, Norwell Massachusetts 02061, operating as a collection agency, and is a “debt collector” as the term is defined by 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(6).

7. Does 1-10 (the “Collectors”) are individual collectors employed by EOS and whose identities are currently unknown to the Plaintiff. One or more of the Collectors may be joined as parties once their identities are disclosed through discovery.

8. EOS at all times acted by and through one or more of the Collectors.

ALLEGATIONS APPLICABLE TO ALL COUNTS

A. The Debt

9. The Plaintiff incurred a financial obligation in the approximate amount of \$ 3,000.00 (the “Debt”) to Winchester Hospital (the “Creditor”).

10. The Debt arose from services provided by the Creditor which were primarily for family, personal or household purposes and which meets the definition of a “debt” under 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(5).

11. The Debt was purchased, assigned or transferred to EOS for collection, or EOS was employed by the Creditor to collect the Debt.

12. The Defendants attempted to collect the Debt and, as such, engaged in “communications” as defined in 15 U.S.C. § 1692a(2).

B. EOS Engages in Harassment and Abusive Tactics

13. Plaintiffs entered into a payment agreement with the Creditor after having been contacted by Defendants. Plaintiffs informed Defendants about the afore-mentioned agreement and requested Defendants cease calls. Nonetheless, Defendants continued collection efforts.

14. Defendants called Plaintiffs' residential phone line in an attempt to collect the debt with the intent to annoy and harass.

15. Defendants placed automated calls with pre-recorded voice messages on Plaintiffs' residential phone line in an attempt to collect the Debt.

16. Defendants placed automated calls with pre-recorded voice messages on Plaintiff's sister's residential phone line, disclosing that they are a collection agency.

17. Defendants were rude when speaking to Plaintiff. To Plaintiff's explanations that she is in payment agreement with the Creditor, Defendants replied: "I don't care. You need to pay us!"

18. Defendants failed to inform Plaintiffs of their rights under the state and federal laws by written correspondence within 5 days after the initial communication, including the right to dispute the Debt.

C. Plaintiff Suffered Actual Damages

19. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the Defendants' unlawful conduct.

20. As a direct consequence of the Defendants' acts, practices and conduct, the Plaintiff suffered and continues to suffer from humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment.

21. The Defendants' conduct was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

COUNT I
VIOLATIONS OF THE FDCPA 15 U.S.C. § 1692, et seq.

22. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

23. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(1) in that Defendants contacted third parties and failed to identify themselves and further failed to confirm or correct location information.

24. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692b(3) in that Defendants contacted third parties in regards to the Plaintiff's debt on numerous occasions, without being asked to do so.

25. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(a)(1) in that Defendants contacted the Plaintiff at a place and during a time known to be inconvenient for the Plaintiff.

26. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692c(b) in that Defendants communicated with individuals other than the Plaintiff, the Plaintiff's attorney, or a credit bureau.

27. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(5) in that Defendants caused a phone to ring repeatedly and engaged the Plaintiff in telephone conversations, with the intent to annoy and harass.

28. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692d(6) in that Defendants placed calls to the Plaintiff without disclosing the identity of the debt collection agency.

29. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692e(10) in that Defendants employed false and deceptive means to collect a debt.

30. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(1) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the amount of the Debt.

31. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(2) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the name of the original creditor to whom the Debt was owed.

32. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(3) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice stating the Plaintiff's right to dispute the Debt within thirty days.

33. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(4) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice informing the Plaintiff of a right to have verification and judgment mailed to the Plaintiff.

34. The Defendants' conduct violated 15 U.S.C. § 1692g(a)(5) in that Defendants failed to send the Plaintiff a validation notice containing the name and address of the original creditor.

35. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the FDCPA, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

36. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of Defendants' violations.

COUNT II
VIOLATION OF THE MASSACHUSETTS CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT,
M.G.L. c. 93A § 2, et seq.

37. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

38. The Defendants employed unfair or deceptive acts to collect the Debt, in violation of M.G.L. c. 93A § 2.

39. Defendant's failure to comply with these provisions constitutes an unfair or deceptive act under M.G.L. c. 93A § 9 and, as such, the Plaintiff is entitled to double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees.

COUNT III
VIOLATIONS OF THE TELEPHONE CONSUMER PROTECTION ACT –
47 U.S.C. § 227, et seq.

40. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

41. Without prior consent the Defendants made telephone calls to the Plaintiff's residential telephone line using an artificial or prerecorded voice to deliver a message without the prior express consent of the Plaintiff in violation of 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(1)(B).

42. The foregoing acts and omissions of the Defendants constitute numerous and multiple violations of the Telephone Consumer Protection Act, including every one of the above-cited provisions.

43. The Plaintiff is entitled to damages as a result of the Defendants' violations.

COUNT IV
INVASION OF PRIVACY BY INTRUSION UPON SECLUSION

44. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

45. The Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) defines intrusion upon seclusion as, "One who intentionally intrudes...upon the solitude or seclusion of another, or his private affairs

or concerns, is subject to liability to the other for invasion of privacy, if the intrusion would be highly offensive to a reasonable person.”

46. Massachusetts further recognizes the Plaintiff’s right to be free from invasions of privacy, thus Defendant violated Massachusetts state law.

47. The Defendant intentionally intruded upon Plaintiff’s right to privacy by continually harassing the Plaintiff with numerous calls to Plaintiff’s residential phone line, including weekend calls; and by calling Plaintiff’s sister and disclosing that Plaintiffs owed debt.

48. The telephone calls made by Defendant to the Plaintiff were so persistent and repeated with such frequency as to be considered, “hounding the plaintiff,” and, “a substantial burden to her existence,” thus satisfying the Restatement of Torts, Second, § 652(b) requirement for an invasion of privacy.

49. The conduct of the Defendant in engaging in the illegal collection activities resulted in multiple invasions of privacy in such a way as would be considered highly offensive to a reasonable person.

50. As a result of the intrusions and invasions, the Plaintiff is entitled to actual damages in an amount to be determined at trial from Defendant.

51. All acts of Defendant and its agents were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendant is subject to punitive damages.

COUNT V
INTENTIONAL INFLICTION OF EMOTIONAL DISTRESS

52. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully set forth herein at length.

53. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants vis-à-vis the Plaintiff was so outrageous in character, and so extreme in degree, as to go beyond all possible bounds of decency, and to be regarded as atrocious, and utterly intolerable in a civilized community.

54. The foregoing conduct constitutes the tort of intentional infliction of emotional distress under the laws of the State of Massachusetts.

55. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to imposition of punitive damages.

COUNT VI
COMMON LAW FRAUD

56. The Plaintiff incorporates by reference all of the above paragraphs of this Complaint as though fully stated herein.

57. The acts, practices and conduct engaged in by the Defendants and complained of herein constitute fraud under the Common Law of the State of Massachusetts.

58. The Plaintiff has suffered and continues to suffer actual damages as a result of the foregoing acts and practices, including damages associated with, among other things, humiliation, anger, anxiety, emotional distress, fear, frustration and embarrassment caused by the Defendants. All acts of Defendants and the Collectors complained of herein were committed with malice, intent, wantonness, and recklessness, and as such, Defendants are subject to punitive damages.

PRAYER FOR RELIEF

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff prays that judgment be entered against Defendants:

1. Actual damages pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(1) against Defendants;
2. Statutory damages of \$1,000.00 for each violation pursuant to 15 U.S.C. §1692k(a)(2)(A) against Defendants;
3. Costs of litigation and reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to 15 U.S.C. § 1692k(a)(3) against Defendants;
4. Double or treble damages plus reasonable attorney's fees pursuant to M.G.L. c. 93A § 3(A);
5. Statutory damages pursuant to 47 U.S.C. § 227(b)(3)(B) & (C);
6. Actual damages from Defendants for the all damages including emotional distress suffered as a result of the intentional, reckless, and/or negligent FDCPA violations and intentional, reckless, and/or negligent invasions of privacy in an amount to be determined at trial for the Plaintiff;
7. Punitive damages; and
8. Such other and further relief as may be just and proper.

TRIAL BY JURY DEMANDED ON ALL COUNTS

Dated: October 26, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

By /s/ Sergei Lemberg

Sergei Lemberg (BBO# 650671)
LEMBERG & ASSOCIATES L.L.C.
1100 Summer Street, 3rd Floor
Stamford, CT 06905
Telephone: (203) 653-2250
Facsimile: (877) 795-3666
Attorneys for Plaintiff